

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on November 3, 2005. In order to advance prosecution, claims 1-6 are cancelled, without prejudice. Claim 7 is amended consistent with the disclosure to more explicitly recite the vacuum distillation step therein. New claim 8 corresponds to former claim 4. New claim 9 corresponds to former claim 6. Entry of this Amendment – in order to place the application into condition for allowance or into better condition for appeal – is respectfully solicited. With this Amendment, claims 7-9 are pending in the application.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,288,831 (Ichinohe et al.). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichinohe et al. in view of US 4,150,048 (Schilling). Both of these rejections are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 3 and 4.

Claims 1 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,288,831 (Ichinohe et al.). The Ichinohe et al. reference teaches treating unreacted propenyl ether polyether with water, an aqueous solution of pH no greater than 7, or an acidic substance such as a mineral acid, an organic acid, or a Lewis acid, preferably with the application of heat, until all of the residual propenyl ether polyether is decomposed, and then removing propionaldehyde product from the remaining reaction mixture. Column 4, lines 31-36. In contrast, the method of the present invention does not pre-treat unreacted polyether, but simply distills it off. Therefore, the present method is much simpler than is that taught by the Ichinohe

Application No.: 10/752,501  
Amendment dated February 3, 2006  
Response to Office Action dated November 3, 2005

Docket No.: 4710-0105P

et al. reference. Moreover, the composition produced by the method of the present invention is cleaner than the composition produced by the reference method, because in the present invention there is no possibility of inclusion of contaminants such as chloride ions used in the Ichinohe et al. process. Accordingly, *the composition produced by the present method is particularly suitable for use as a solvent of an electrolytic solution, where ionic impurities should not be present.* This advantage is not suggested by the Ichinohe et al. disclosure, because that disclosure is concerned only with the removal of odor for cosmetic applications. Clearly, the present invention is both novel and unobvious with respect to the disclosure of Ichinohe et al.

If any questions arise regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Richard Gallagher (Reg. No. 28,781) at (703) 205-8008.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2448, under Order No. 4710-0105P from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Gerald M. Murphy, Jr.  
Registration No.: 28,977  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant